# COCACOLA: binning metagenomic contigs using sequence COmposition, read CoverAge, CO-alignment, and paired-end read LinkAge

Yang Young Lu[1], Ting Chen[1,3], Jed A. Fuhrman[2], and Fengzhu Sun[1,4*]

[1]Molecular and Computational Biology Program, Department of Biological Sciences, University of Southern California, CA, USA
[2]Department of Biological Sciences and Wrigley Institute for Environmental Studies, University of Southern California, CA, USA
[3]Center for Synthetic and Systems Biology, TNLIST, Beijing, China
[4]Center for Computational Systems Biology, Fudan University, Shanghai, China

arXiv:1604.02512v1 [q-bio.GN] 9 Apr 2016

**Abstract.** The advent of next-generation sequencing (NGS) technologies enables researchers to sequence complex microbial communities directly from environment. Since assembly typically produces only genome fragments, also known as contigs, instead of entire genome, it is crucial to group them into operational taxonomic units (OTUs) for further taxonomic profiling and down-streaming functional analysis. OTU clustering is also referred to as binning. We present COCACOLA, a general framework automatically bin contigs into OTUs based upon sequence composition and coverage across multiple samples. The effectiveness of COCACOLA is demonstrated in both simulated and real datasets in comparison to state-of-art binning approaches such as CONCOCT, GroopM, MaxBin and MetaBAT. The superior performance of COCACOLA relies on two aspects. One is employing $L_1$ distance instead of Euclidean distance for better taxonomic identification during initialization. More importantly, COCACOLA takes advantage of both hard clustering and soft clustering by sparsity regularization. In addition, the COCACOLA framework seamlessly embraces customized knowledge to facilitate binning accuracy. In our study, we have investigated two types of additional knowledge, the co-alignment to reference genomes and linkage of contigs provided by paired-end reads, as well as the ensemble of both. We find that both co-alignment and linkage information further improve binning in the majority of cases. COCACOLA is scalable and faster than CONCOCT ,GroopM, MaxBin and MetaBAT.
The software is available at https://github.com/younglululu/COCACOLA

## 1 Introduction

Metagenomic studies aim to understand microbial communities directly from environmental samples without cultivating member species [31]. The next-generation sequencing technologies (NGS) allow biologists to extract genomic data with unprecedented high resolution and sufficient sequence depth, offering insights into complex microbial communities even including species with very low abundance [1]. To further investigate the taxonomic structure of microbial samples, assembled sequence fragments, also known as contigs, need be grouped into operational taxonomic units (OTUs) that ultimately represent genomes or significant parts of genomes. OTU clustering is also called binning (or genomic binning), serving as the key step towards taxonomic profiling and downstream functional analysis. Therefore, accurate binning of the contigs is an essential problem in metagenomic studies.

Despite extensive studies, accurate binning of contigs remains challenging for several major reasons, including chimeric assemblies due to repetitive sequence regions within or across genomes, sequencing errors or artifacts, strain-level variation within the same species, etc. [2, 25] The currently available binning methods can be broadly categorized into classification and clustering approaches. Classification approaches are "taxonomy dependent", that is, reference databases are needed for the assignment from contigs or reads to meaningful taxons. The classification is either based on homology due to sequence identity, or genomic signatures such as oligonucleotide composition patterns and taxonomic clades. Homology-based methods include MEGAN [14] that assigns reads to the lowest common taxonomic ancestor. Examples of genomic signature-based methods include PhyloPythia [26] and Kraken [40] that are composition-based classifiers and naive Bayesian classifier (NBC) [32], a clade-specific approach. In addition, hybrid methods are available to take both

alignment and composition-based strategy into consideration, such as PhymmBL [5] and SPHINX [27].

In comparison, clustering approaches are "taxonomy independent", that is, no additional reference databases or taxonomic information is needed. These approaches require similarity measurements from GC content, tetra-mer composition [1, 9, 43], or Interpolated Markov Models [19], to contig coverage profile [3, 42].

Recently, several methods have been developed to bin contigs using the coverage profiles of the contigs across multiple metagenomic samples [1, 2, 8, 16, 18, 28, 41] . Here the coverage of a contig is defined as the fraction of reads mapped to the contig in a sample. The idea is that if two contigs are from the same genome, their coverage profiles across multiple samples should be highly correlated. These methods can be further improved by integrating coverage profiles with the sequence tetra-mer composition of the contigs [2, 16, 18] Among these methods, GroopM [16] is advantageous in its visualized and interactive pipeline. On one hand, it is flexible, allowing users to merge and split bins under expert intervention. On the other hand, in the absence of expert intervention, the automatic binning results of GroopM is not as satisfactory as CONCOCT [2]. CONCOCT [2] makes use of the Gaussian mixture model (GMM) to cluster contigs into bins. Also, CONCOCT provides a mechanism to automatically determine the optimal OTU number by variational Bayesian model selection [12]. MetaBAT [18] calculates integrated distance for pairwise contigs and then clusters contigs iteratively by modified K-medoids algorithm. And MaxBin [41] compares the distributions of distances between and within the same genomes.

In this paper we present COCACOLA, a general framework for contig binning incorporating sequence COmposition, CoverAge, CO-alignment and paired-end reads LinkAge across multiple samples. By default, COCACOLA utilizes sequence composition and coverage across multiple samples for binning. Compared to recent approaches such as CONCOCT, GroopM, MaxBin and MetaBAT, COCACOLA performs better in three aspects. Firstly, COCACOLA reveals superiority with respect to precision, recall and Adjusted Rand Index (ARI). Secondly, COCACOLA shows better robustness in the case of varying number of samples. COCACOLA is scalable and faster than CONCOCT, GroopM, MaxBin andMetaBAT.

In addition, the COCACOLA framework seamlessly embraces customized knowledge to facilitate binning accuracy. In our study, we have investigated two types of knowledge, in particular, the co-alignment to reference genomes and linkage between contigs provided by paired-end reads. We find that both co-alignment and linkage information facilitate better binning performance in the majority of cases.

## 2 Materials and Methods

### 2.1 Problem Formulation

A microbial community is comprised of a set of OTUs at different abundance levels, and our objective is to put contigs into the genomic OTU bins from which they were originally derived. OTUs are expected to be disentangled based on contigs comprising either the discriminative abundance or dissimilarity among sequences in terms of $l$-mer composition. The rationale of binning contigs into OTUs relies on the underlying assumption that contigs originating from the same OTU share similar relative abundance as well as sequence composition.

Formally, we encode the abundance and composition of the $k$-th OTU by a $(M+V)$ dimensional feature vector, $W_{\cdot k}$, $k = 1, 2, \cdots, K$, where $M$ is the number of samples, $V$ is the number of distinct $l$-mers, and $K$ is the total OTU number. Specifically, $W_{mk}$ represents the abundance of the $k$-th OTU in the $m$-th sample , $m = 1, 2, \cdots, M$, respectively. And $W_{M+v,k}$ stands for the $l$-mer relative frequency composition of the $k$-th OTU, $v = 1, 2, \cdots, V$. Similarly, the feature vector of the $n$-th contig is denoted as $X_{\cdot n}$. Let $\mathbb{H}_{kn}$ be the indicator function describing whether the $n$-th contig belongs to the $k$-th OTU, i.e., $\mathbb{H}_{kn} = 1$ means the $n$-th contig originating from the $k$-th OTU and $\mathbb{H}_{kn} = 0$ otherwise. Therefore, $X_{\cdot n}$ can be represented as:

$$X_{\cdot n} = \mathbb{H}_{1n} W_{\cdot 1} + \mathbb{H}_{2n} W_{\cdot 2} + \cdots + \mathbb{H}_{kn} W_{\cdot K}, \;\; n = 1, 2, \cdots, N \tag{1}$$

where $N$ is the number of contigs. Equation (1) can be further written into the matrix form:

$$X \approx W\mathbb{H} \quad s.t. \;\; W \geq 0, \;\; \mathbb{H} \in \{0,1\}^{K \times N}, \|\mathbb{H}_{\cdot n}\|_0 = 1 \tag{2}$$

where $W = (W_{\cdot 1}, W_{\cdot 2}, \cdots, W_{\cdot K})$ is a $(M+V) \times K$ nonnegative matrix with each column encoding the feature vector of the corresponding OTU. And $\mathbb{H} = (\mathbb{H}_{\cdot 1}, \mathbb{H}_{\cdot 2}, \cdots, \mathbb{H}_{\cdot N})$ is a $K \times N$ binary matrix with each column encoding the indicator function of the corresponding contig. $\|\mathbb{H}_{\cdot n}\|_0 = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \mathbb{H}_{kn} = 1$ ensures the $n$-th contig belongs exclusively to only one particular OTU.

The matrices $W$ and $\mathbb{H}$ are obtained by minimizing a certain objective function. In this paper we use Frobenius norm, commonly known as the sum of squared error:

$$\arg \min_{W,\mathbb{H} \geq 0} \|X - W\mathbb{H}\|_F^2 \quad s.t. \;\; \mathbb{H} \in \{0,1\}^{K \times N}, \|\mathbb{H}_{\cdot n}\|_0 = 1 \tag{3}$$

Note that Equation (3) is NP-hard by formulation as an integer programming problem with an exponential number of feasible solutions [17]. A common procedure to tackle Equation (3) relaxes binary constraint of $\mathbb{H}$ with numerical values. Hence Equation (3) is reformulated as the following minimization problem:

$$\arg \min_{W,H} \|X - WH\|_F^2 \qquad s.t. \;\; W, H \geq 0 \tag{4}$$

where $H$ serves as a coefficient matrix instead of an indicator matrix. In the scenario of Equation (4), $W_{\cdot k}$, the feature vector of the $k$-th OTU , represents the centroid of the $k$-th cluster. Meanwhile, each contig $X_{\cdot n}$ is approximated by a weighted mixture of clusters, where the weights are encoded in $H_{\cdot n}$. In other words, relaxation of binary constraint makes the interpretation from hard clustering to soft clustering, where hard clustering means that a contig can be assigned to one OTU only, while soft clustering allows a contig to be assigned to multiple OTUs. It has been observed that by imposing sparsity on each column of $H$, the hard clustering behavior can be facilitated [20]. Therefore, Equation (4) is further modified through the Sparse Nonnegative Matrix Factorization (SNMF) form [20]:

$$\arg \min_{W,H \geq 0} \|X - WH\|_F^2 + \alpha \sum_{n=1}^{N} \|H_{\cdot n}\|_1^2 \tag{5}$$

where $\|\cdot\|_1$ indicates $L_1$-norm. Due to non-negativity of $H$, $\|H_{\cdot n}\|_1$ stands for the column sum of the $n$-th column vector of $H$. The parameter $\alpha > 0$ controls the trade-off between approximation accuracy and the sparseness of $H$. Namely, larger $\alpha$ implies stronger sparsity while smaller value ensures better approximation accuracy.

### 2.2 Feature Matrix Representation of Contigs

Similar to CONCOCT [2], each contig longer than 1000bp is represented by a $(M+V)$ dimensional column feature vector including $M$ dimensional coverage and $V$ dimensional tetra-mer composition. The coverage denotes the average number of mapped reads per base pair from each of $M$ different samples. While the tetra-mer composition denotes the tetra-mer frequency for the contig itself plus its reverse complement. Due to palindromic tetra-mers, $V = 136$.

Adopting the notation of CONCOCT [2], the coverage of all the $N$ contigs is represented by an $N \times M$ matrix $Y$, where $N$ is the number of contigs of interest and $Y_{nm}$ indicates the coverage of the $n$-th contig from the $m$-th sample. Whereas the tetra-mer composition of the $N$ contigs are represented by an $N \times V$ matrix $Z$ where $Z_{nv}$ indicates the count of $v$-th tetra-mer found in the $n$-th contig. Before normalization, a pseudo-count is added to each entry of the coverage matrix $Y$ and composition matrix $Z$, respectively. As for the coverage, a small value is added, i.e., $Y'_{nm} = Y_{nm} + 100/L_n$, analogous to a single read aligned to each contig as prior, where $L_n$ is the length of the $n$-th contig. As for the composition, a single count is simply added, i.e., $Z'_{nv} = Z_{nv} + 1$.

The coverage matrix $Y$ is firstly column-wise normalized (i.e., normalization within each individual sample), followed by row-wise normalization (i.e., normalization across $M$ samples) to obtain coverage profile $p$. The row-wise normalization aims to mitigate sequencing efficiency heterogeneity among contigs.

$$Y''_{nm} = \frac{Y'_{nm}}{\sum_{n=1}^{N} Y'_{nm}} \qquad p_{nm} = \frac{Y''_{nm}}{\sum_{m=1}^{M} Y''_{nm}} \tag{6}$$

The composition matrix $Z$ is row-wise normalized for each contig (i.e., normalization across $M$ tetra-mer count) to obtain composition profile $q$:

$$q_{nv} = \frac{Z'_{nv}}{\sum_{v=1}^{V} Z'_{nv}} \tag{7}$$

The feature matrix of contigs is denoted as $X = [p\ q]^T$, as the combination of coverage profile $p$ and composition profile $q$. To be specific, $X$ is a $(M + V) \times N$ nonnegative matrix of which each column represents the feature vector of a particular contig.

### 2.3 Incorporating Additional Information into Binning

We consider two types of additional knowledge that may enhance the binning accuracy [4]. One option is paired-end reads linkage. Specifically, a high number of links connecting two contigs imply high possibility that they belong to the same OTU. Since the linkage may be erroneous due to the existence of chimeric sequences, we keep linkages that are reported through multiple samples. The other option is co-alignment to reference genomes. That is, two contigs mapped to the same reference genome support the evidence that they belong to the same OTU.

We encode additional knowledge by an undirected network in the form of a nonnegative weight matrix $A$, where $A_{nn'}$ quantifies the confidence level we believe the $n$-th contig and the $n'$-th contig to be clustered together. Based upon the aforementioned matrix $\mathbf{A}$, a network regularization item is introduced to measure the coherence of binning [6]:

$$R_g = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n,n'=1}^{N} \|H_{\cdot n} - H_{\cdot n'}\|^2 A_{nn'} = Tr(HLH^T) \tag{8}$$

where $Tr(\cdot)$ indicates the matrix trace, the sum of items along the diagonal. $D$ denotes the diagonal matrix whose entries are column sums (or row sums due to symmetry) of $A$, i.e., $D_{nn} = \sum_{n'=1}^{N} A_{nn'}$. The *Laplacian matrix* [10] is defined as $L = D - A$. With convention we use *normalized Laplacian matrix* instead, that is, $\mathcal{L} = D^{-1/2}LD^{-1/2} = I - D^{-1/2}AD^{-1/2} \triangleq I - \mathcal{A}$. By incorporating the network regularization in Equation (8), the objective function in Equation (5) changes to the following form:

$$\arg\min_{W,H\geq 0} \|X - WH\|_F^2 + \alpha \sum_{n=1}^{N} \|H_{\cdot n}\|_1^2 + \beta\, Tr(H\mathcal{L}H^T) \tag{9}$$

where the parameter $\beta > 0$ controls the trade-off of belief between unsupervised binning and additional knowledge. Namely, large $\beta$ indicates strong confidence on the additional knowledge. Conversely, small $\beta$ puts more weight on the data.

To utilize multiple additional knowledge sources together, a combined *Laplacian matrix* is constructed as a weighted average of individual *Laplacian matrices* $\bar{\mathcal{L}} = \left(\sum_d \alpha_d \mathcal{L}_d\right) / \left(\sum_d \alpha_d\right)$ where each positive weight $\alpha_d$ reflects the contribution of the corresponding information. For simplicity weights are treated equally in the paper.

### 2.4 Optimization by Alternating Nonnegative Least Squares (ANLS)

Among comprehensive algorithms to solve Equation (9), the multiplicative updating approach [22] is most widely used. Despite its simplicity in implementation, slow convergence is of high concern. This paper adopts a more efficient algorithm with provable convergence called alternating nonnegative least squares (ANLS) [20]. ANLS iteratively handles two nonnegative least square (NNLS) subproblems in Equation (10) until convergence. The ANLS algorithm is summarized in Algorithm 1.

$$H \leftarrow \arg\min_{H\geq 0} \|X - WH\|_F^2 + \alpha \sum_{n=1}^{N} \|H_{\cdot n}\|_1^2 + \beta\, Tr(H\mathcal{L}H^T) \tag{10a}$$

$$W \leftarrow \arg\min_{W\geq 0} \left\|X^T - H^T W^T\right\|_F^2 \tag{10b}$$

We solve Equation (10a) by block coordinate descent (BCD), that is, we divide Equation (10a) into $N$ subproblems and minimize the objective function with respect to each subproblem at a

**Algorithm 1** Optimization by Alternating Nonnegative Least Squares

**Input:** feature matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{(M+V)\times N}$, initial basis matrix $W \in \mathbb{R}^{(M+V)\times K}$ and coefficient matrix $H \in \mathbb{R}^{K\times N}$, tolerance threshold $\varepsilon$, maximum iteration threshold $T$

1: **repeat**
2: Obtain optimal $H$ of Equation (10a) by fixing $W$
3: Obtain optimal $W$ of Equation (10b) by fixing $H$
4: **until** A particular stopping criterion involving $\varepsilon$ is satisfied or iteration number exceeds $T$

**Output:** $W$,$H$

time while keep the rest fixed:

$$\begin{aligned} &\arg\min_{H_{\cdot n}\geq 0} \|X_{\cdot n} - WH_{\cdot n}\|_2^2 + \alpha \|H_{\cdot n}\|_1^2 + \beta\, H_{\cdot n}^T \mathcal{L} H_{\cdot n},\ n = 1, \cdots, N \\ =&\arg\min_{H_{\cdot n}\geq 0} \|X_{\cdot n} - WH_{\cdot n}\|_2^2 + \alpha \|H_{\cdot n}\|_1^2 + \beta\, H_{\cdot n}^T (H_{\cdot n} - 2\sum_{n'=1}^{N} \mathcal{A}_{nn'} H_{\cdot n'}^{old}) \\ =&\arg\min_{H_{\cdot n}\geq 0} \|X_{\cdot n} - WH_{\cdot n}\|_2^2 + \alpha \|H_{\cdot n}\|_1^2 + \beta \left\| H_{\cdot n} - \sum_{n'=1}^{N} \mathcal{A}_{nn'} H_{\cdot n'}^{old} \right\|_2^2 \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where the matrix $H^{old}$ denotes the value of $H$ obtained from the previous iteration. Following Jacobi updating rule, we combine $N$ subproblems in Equation (11) into the matrix form:

$$\arg\min_{H\geq 0} \left\| \begin{pmatrix} X \\ 0_{1\times N} \\ \sqrt{\beta} H^{old} \mathcal{A} \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} W \\ \sqrt{\alpha} e_{1\times K} \\ \sqrt{\beta} I_K \end{pmatrix} H \right\|_F^2 \tag{12}$$

where $0_{1\times N}$ is a $N$ dimensional row vector of all 0, $e_{1\times K}$ is a $K$ dimensional row vector of all 1.

### 2.5 Initialization of $W$ and $H$

Note that we need to initialize $W$ and $H$ as the input to Algorithm 1. A good initialization not only enhances the accuracy of the solution, but facilitates fast convergence to a better local minima as well [21]. We initialize $W$ and $H$ by K-means clustering, namely, $W$ is set to be the K-means centroid of $X$ with each column $W_{\cdot k}$ corresponding to the feature vector of the $k$-th centroid. Meanwhile, $H$ is set to be the indicator matrix encoding the cluster assignment.

The distance measurement contributes crucially to the success of binning. Ideally, a proper distance measurement exhibits more distinguishable taxonomic difference. The traditional K-means approach takes Euclidean distance as default measurement to quantify closeness. However, as for the coverage profile, Su *et al.*[35] shows $L_1$ distance produces more reasonable binning results than Euclidean and correlation-based distances. As for the composition profile, $L_1$ distance also reveals superiority over Euclidean and cosine distances [23]. Therefore, our method adopts K-means clustering with $L_1$ distance. Once preliminary K-means clustering is achieved, we eliminate suspicious clusters with few contigs using the bottom-up L Method [33].

### 2.6 Parameter Tuning

We have two parameters $(\alpha, \beta)$ to be tuned in our algorithm. Traditional cross-validation-like strategy demands searching through a two dimensional grid of candidate values, which is computationally unaffordable in the case of large datasets. Instead, we firstly search a good marginal $\alpha$ value by fixing $\beta = 0$. After that, a one dimensional search is performed on a range of candidate $\beta$ values while keeping $\alpha$ fixed.

In our implementation, when $\beta = 0$, $\alpha$ is approximated by the Lagrange Multiplier of Equation (4) with constraint $\sum_{n=1}^{N} (\|H_{\cdot n}\|_1 - 1)^2 = 0$, denoted by $\alpha^*$. Then we run the algorithm with respect to each candidate $\beta$ and fixed $\alpha = \alpha^*$, resulting in corresponding binning results with various cluster number. Notice that traditional internal cluster validity indices are only applicable on the basis of fixed cluster number scenario [39], such as SSE (Sum of Square Error), Davies-Bouldin

index [13], etc. To be specific, the indices have the tendency towards monotonically increase or decrease as the cluster number increases [24]. We tackle the impact of monotonicity by adopting TSS minimization index [36], that is, we choose the candidate $\beta$ with minimum TSS value, recorded as $\beta^*$. Then we can solve Equation (9) by using $(\alpha^*, \beta^*)$ as selected regularization parameters.

### 2.7 Post-processing

The resulting binning obtained from Algorithm 1 may contain clusters that are closely mixed to each other. Therefore, we define *separable conductance* as an effective measurement to diagnose the coupling closeness of pairwise clusters, so as to determine whether to merge them. Namely, we consider each cluster as having a spherical scope centered at its centroid. To be robust against outliers, the radius is chosen as the third quartile among the intra-cluster distances. The *separable conductance* between the $c_1$-th cluster and the $c_2$-th cluster, $sep(c_1, c_2)$, is defined as the number of contigs from the $c_1$-th cluster also included in the spherical scope of the $c_2$-th cluster, divided by the smaller cluster size of two. Intuitively, the *separable conductance* exploits the overlap between two clusters. The procedure of post-processing works as follows: we keep picking the pair of clusters with maximum *separable conductance* and merge them until it fails to exceed a certain threshold. The threshold is set to be 1 in this study.

### 2.8 Datasets

Alneberg *et al.* [2] simulated a "species" dataset and another "strain" dataset. Both simulated datasets were constructed based upon 16S rRNA samples originated from the Human Microbiome Project (HMP) [11]. The relative abundance profiles of the different species/strains for the simulation were based on the HMP samples as well.

The simulated "species" dataset consisted of 101 different species across 96 samples. It aimed to test the ability of CONCOCT to cluster contigs in complex populations [2]. The species were approximated by the operational taxonomic units (OTUs) from HMP with more than 3% sequence differences. Each species was guaranteed to appear in at least 20 samples. A total of 37,628 contigs remain for binning after co-assembly and filtering.

The simulated "strain" dataset aimed to test the ability of CONCOCT to cluster contigs at different levels of taxonomic resolution [2]. To be more specific, the simulated "strain" dataset consisted of 20 different species or strains from the same species across 64 samples, including five different *E. coli* strains, five different *Bacteroides* species, five different species from different *Clostridium* genera, and five different *gut* bacteria. It was challenging for CONCOCT to separate the five different *E. coli* strains [2]. A total of 9,417 contigs remain for binning after co-assembly and filtering.

In addition to two simulated datasets, We use a time-series study of 11 fecal microbiome samples from a premature infant [34], denoted as the "Sharon" dataset. Since the true species that contigs belong to are not known, we assign the class labels by annotating contigs using the TAXAassign script [15]. As a result, $2,614$ out of $5,579$ contigs are unambiguously labeled on the species level for evaluation. Another real dataset embody 264 samples from the MetaHIT consortium [30] (SRA:ERP000108), the same dataset used in MetaBAT [18], denoted as the "MetaHIT" dataset. $17,136$ out of $192,673$ co-assembled contigs are unambiguously labeled on the species level for evaluation.

### 2.9 Evaluation Criteria

To evaluate a binning result with $K$ clusters symbolizing predicted OTUs, against targeted $S$ species, a $K \times S$ matrix $A = (a_{ks})$ can be constructed so that $a_{ks}$ indicates the shared number of contigs between the $k$-th OTU and the $s$-th species. Therefore, $a_{k\cdot} = \sum_s a_{ks}$ and $a_{\cdot s} = \sum_k a_{ks}$ stand for the size of the $k$-th OTU and the $s$-th species, respectively.

One evaluation measurement focuses on if pairs of contigs belonging to the same species can be clustered together , such as Adjusted Rand Index (ARI). Given the knowledge of the species to which each contig is mapped, we treat the corresponding species as class labels. Then the classification of pairs of contigs falls into one of the four cases: $TP$ (True Positive) and $FP$ (False Positive) represent the number of pairs of contigs that truly belong to the same species being clustered into the same OTUs and distinct OTUs, respectively; $FN$ (False Negative) and $TN$

(True Negative) stand for the number of pairs of contigs from different species being clustered into the same OTUs and distinct OTUs, respectively. ARI is calculated as Equation (13):

$$\begin{aligned} ARI &= \frac{2\left(TP \times TN - FP \times FN\right)}{FP^2 + FN^2 + 2 \times TP \times TN + (TP + TN) \times (FP + FN)} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{k,s} \binom{a_{ks}}{2} - t_3}{\frac{1}{2}\left(t_1 + t_2\right) - t_3} \\ where\ \ t_1 &= \sum_k \binom{a_{k\cdot}}{2},\ \ t_2 = \sum_s \binom{a_{\cdot s}}{2},\ \ t_3 = \frac{2t_1 t_2}{\binom{N}{2}} \end{aligned}$$

where $N$ is the total number of contigs. In addition to ARI, we also consider *precision* and *recall* defined as follows:

$$\texttt{precision} = \frac{1}{N}\sum_k \max_s \{a_{ks}\}. \qquad \texttt{recall} = \frac{1}{N}\sum_s \max_k \{a_{ks}\}.$$

## 3 Results

Given the same input, i.e., sequence composition and coverage across multiple samples, we show the effectiveness of COCACOLA on simulated "species" and "strain" datasets, in comparison with three state-of-art, methodologically distinct methods for contigs binning: CONCOCT [2], GroopM [16], MaxBin [41] and MetaBAT [18]. The comparison excludes Canopy [28] that is based on binning co-abundant gene groups instead of binning contigs. Furthermore, we investigate the performance improvement of COCACOLA after incorporating two additional knowledge, co-alignment to reference genomes and linkage between contigs provided by paired-end reads, as well as the ensemble of both. Results reveal both information facilitating better performance in the majority of cases. Finally, we report the performance of COCACOLA on two real datasets.

### 3.1 Performance on the Simulated Datasets

Even though both COCACOLA and CONCOCT are able to deterine the OTU number automatically, an initial estimation of OTU number $K$ is needed to start from. Since the OTU number is usually unknown, we study the binning performance with respect to the value of $K$ chosen empirically, then we study the effect of varying $K$ on the binning results (Section 3.2).

We observed that K-means clustering tends to generate empty clusters given large $K$. Our strategy is to increase $K$ until there are more than $K/2$ empty clusters, and we choose the corresponding $K$ as the input. At this stage, we emphasize more on the redundancy of OTU number rather than the accuracy. Thus, we obtain $K = 192$ and $K = 48$ as input to the simulated "species" and "strain" dataset, respectively.

For the simulated "species" dataset, Figure 1(a) compares COCACOLA against CONCOCT, GroopM, MaxBin and MetaBAT in terms of precision, recall and ARI. The precision of COCACOLA is 0.9978, suggesting that almost all contigs within each cluster originate from the same species. In comparison, the precision of CONCOCT, GroopM, MaxBin and MetaBAT is 0.9343, 0.9324, 0.9973 and 0.9958, respectively. The recall obtained by COCACOLA is 0.9993, implying that nearly all contigs derived from the same species are grouped into the same clusters. In contrast, the recall of CONCOCT, GroopM, MaxBin and MetaBAT is 0.996, 0.881, 0.9973 and 0.9174, respectively. As for ARI, COCACOLA achieves 0.997 while CONCOCT, GroopM, MaxBin and MetaBAT get 0.9296, 0.7922, 0.9961 and 0.9308, respectively.

For the simulated "strain" dataset, the results are shown by Figure 1(b). The precision, recall and ARI of COCACOLA reach 0.9766, 0.9747 and 0.9512, respectively. In comparison, CONCOCT, GroopM, MaxBin and MetaBAT achieve 0.8733, 0.9525, 0.8151 and 0.8730 in terms of precision, 0.9552, 0.7805, 0.9167 and 0.8009 in terms of recall, 0.8809, 0.7529, 0.757 and 0.5858 in terms of ARI, respectively.

We conclude that COCACOLA performs well in constructing species from highly complicated environmental samples. Besides, COCACOLA performs well in handling strain-level variations, which cannot be fully resolved due to assembly limitation [2].




(a) simulated "species" dataset (b) simulated "strain" dataset

(c) real "Sharon" dataset (d) real "MetaHIT" dataset

Fig. 1: The performance of COCACOLA, CONCOCT, GroopM, MaxBin and MetaBAT on both simulated datasets (a,b) and real datasets (c,d).

### 3.2 Impact of Varying Number of Clusters $K$

We study the impact of varying $K$ on the binning results. We apply COCACOLA and CONCOCT to both simulated "species" and "strain" datasets under different values of $K$ (Figure 2). We let $K$ range from the exact number of the real species to four times of it, with 10% increment. Since GroopM, MaxBin and MetaBAT doesn't involve $K$, the corresponding results remain unchanged with different $K$.

In the simulated "species" dataset (Figure 2(a)-(c)), there are several noticeable observations. First, the recall obtained by COCACOLA maintains around $\sim 0.999$, as stably as plateau, slightly larger than $\sim 0.996$ by CONCOCT and 0.9973 by MaxBin, much higher than 0.881 by GroopM and 0.9174 by MetaBAT. The nearly perfect recall for COCACOLA, CONCOCT and MaxBin suggests that almost all contigs in each species are grouped within the same cluster no matter how $K$ is chosen. Second, the precision of both COCACOLA and CONCOCT improves as $K$ increases with some deviations. When $K$ is small, some clusters may contain contigs from different species. As $K$ increases, the contigs in each bin tend to be more homogeneous that they come from the same species, thus precision improves. Notice that MetaBAT performs very well in terms of precision and ARI, it requires a large $K$ for COCACOLA to catch up with.

In the simulated "strain" dataset (Figure 2(d)-(f)), when the number of clusters $K$ varies from 20 to 80, COCACOLA reaches a plateau at $K = 26$ with respect to precision, recall and ARI. Specifically, precision stabilizes at $\sim 0.976$. Recall stabilizes at $\sim 0.976$ meanwhile ARI stabilizes at $\sim 0.9516$. COCACOLA outperforms CONCOCT, MaxBin and MetaBAT almost in all cases except when $K = 78$.

We conclude that COCACOLA tends to perform better with respect to larger $K$ than the exact number the real species, it is understandable because larger $K$ explores the data better.

### 3.3 The Effect of the Number of Samples on the Performance

To evaluate the effect of the number of samples on the performance, we use a fraction of samples as input only. The simulated "species" dataset comprises 96 samples overall. Thus we choose sub-samples of size ranging from 10 to 90, with 10 as increment. To avoid duplicate contribution from a particular sample, we choose sub-samples without overlapping. Therefore, the numbers of sub-samples are $9, 4, 3, 2, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1$, respectively.




Fig. 2: The performance of COCACOLA, CONCOCT, GroopM, MaxBin and MetaBAT in terms of precision, recall and ARI on the simulated "species" and "strain" datasets. The results of simulated "species" dataset are depicted by (a)-(c). And the results of simulated "strain" dataset are depicted by (d)-(f).

We set the number of clusters $K = 200$ for all sub-sample studies. Fig 3 shows the precision, recall and ARI of five methods for the different sub-samples. Notice that the precision, recall and ARI start to decrease when sample size drops below $K = 40$. The major contribution to the decrease is due to the loss of recall, interpreted as over-estimation of OTU numbers. The reasons lie in the fact that hard clustering-like approaches such as COCACOLA are less robust compared to mixture model-like approaches such as CONCOCT. Despite that, COCACOLA demonstrates more robustness in terms of precision and ARI than CONCOCT across all sub-samples.

GroopM demonstrates unstable performance when sample size is small. For instance, as depicted in Figure 3(a) and Figure 3(c), GroopM groups all contigs into one wholistic bin in one sub-sample of size 10 and 30, respectively. In comparison, the bin sizes obtained are 84 and 96 by COCACOLA, 80 and 92 by CONCOCT, respectively.

MaxBin performs the best in the case of small sample size with regard to precision and ARI, however, the superiority roots in the fact that MaxBin excludes a proportion of ambiguous contigs for binning. In comparison, rest methods consider all contigs.

We conclude that COCACOLA and CONCOCT turn out to perform more stably in the case of small sample size compared to GroopM and MetaBAT. When sample size is small, COCACOLA and CONCOCT display different trade-offs between precision and recall. In particular, COCACOLA shows superiority in terms of precision whereas inferiority in terms of recall in comparison to CONCOCT. Overall, COCACOLA outperforms CONCOCT in terms of ARI, an indicator taking both precision and recall into account. When sample size grows large, COCACOLA outperforms CONCOCT in all respects.

### 3.4 The Effect of Incorporating Additional Information on Binning

We investigate the performance improvement of COCACOLA after incorporating two additional knowledge as proposed in the "Methods" section, in particular, co-alignment to reference genomes and linkage between contigs provided by paired-end reads. Moreover, we study the ensemble of both. The comparison is between the binning result by COCACOLA incorporating additional knowledge against the result without. The comparison is based upon sub-samples of the simulated "species" dataset. Since the contributions from additional knowledge nearly diminish when the sample size exceeds $K = 30$, therefore we focus on the 16 cases from $K = 10$ to $K = 30$.




(a) (b) (c)

Fig. 3: Evaluation of COCACOLA, CONCOCT, GroopM, MaxBin and MetaBAT on sensitivity to varying sample size on simulated "species" dataset. The number of sub-samples are 9,4,3,2,1,1,1,1,1, corresponding to sample size 10,20,30,40,50,60,70,80,90, respectively. The result is smoothed by Local Polynomial Regression with confidence interval.

In terms of co-alignment, we design the symmetric weight matrix $\mathbf{A}_{nn'} = 1$ if contig $n$ and contig $n'$ are aligned to the same species using the TAXAassign script [15]. As shown in Figure 4(a)-(c), the precision is improved noticeably in 7 cases and decreased in 3 cases, the recall is improved noticeably in 11 cases and decreased slightly in 1 case, the ARI is improved noticeably in 10 cases and decreased slightly in 2 case.

In terms of linkage, we design the symmetric weighted matrix $\mathbf{A}_{nn'}$ as the number of samples supporting linkage connecting contig $n$ and contig $n'$. As depicted in Figure 4(d)-(f), the precision is improved noticeably in 7 cases and decreased in 2 cases, the recall is improved noticeably in 7 cases and decreased slightly in 4 cases, the ARI is improved noticeably in 5 cases and decreased in 3 cases.

In terms of the ensemble of co-alignment and linkage, as depicted in Figure 4(g)-(i), the precision is improved noticeably in 10 cases and decreased in 3 cases, the recall is improved noticeably in 13 cases and no case suffers decreasing, the ARI is improved noticeably in 11 cases and decreased in 1 cases.

We have the following conclusions: (1) When there are sufficient number of samples, the contributions from additional knowledge diminish. (2) Additional knowledge such as co-alignment and linkage information facilitate better overall performance in the majority of cases. (3) Ensemble of both information performs more stable than individual information.

### 3.5 Performance on Real Datasets

Applying COCACOLA to the "Sharon" dataset (Figure 1(c)), given initial choice of $K = 30$, the precision, recall and ARI reach 0.9889, 0.9759 and 0.9670, respectively. In comparison, CONCOCT, GroopM, MaxBin and MetaBAT achieve 0.9801, 0.9820, 0.7077 and 0.9705 in terms of precision, 0.9606, 0.9147, 0.9767 and 0.8344 in terms of recall, 0.9600, 0.9126, 0.5639 and 0.8634 in terms of ARI, respectively. COCACOLA identifies 6 OTUs corresponding to six reported genomes. In comparison, CONCOCT, GroopM, MaxBin and MetaBAT identify 14, 24, 5 and 11 OTUs, respectively.

Next we investigate the performance improvement of COCACOLA after incorporating additional knowledge. We use linkage information only because it's circular to use TAXAassign script [15] on both alignment and labeling. COCACOLA still identifies 6 OTUs, with the precision, recall and ARI reaching 0.9923, 0.9797 and 0.9743, slightly outperforms the case without additional knowledge.

Applying COCACOLA to the "MetaHIT" dataset (Figure 1(d)), given initial choice of $K = 100$, the precision, recall and ARI reach 0.9082, 0.8272 and 0.7717, respectively. In comparison, CONCOCT, GroopM, MaxBin and MetaBAT achieve 0.8933, 0.5247, 0.6655 and 0.5738 in terms of precision, 0.7901, 0.6843, 0.8228 and 0.7397 in terms of recall, 0.7518, 0.3757, 0.5866 and 0.1088 in terms of ARI, respectively.

Next we investigate the performance improvement of COCACOLA after incorporating linkage information. The performance is further slightly improved from 0.9082 to 0.9084 in terms of precision, from 0.8272 to 0.8350 in terms of recall, and from 0.7717 to 0.7844 in terms of ARI, respectively.




Fig. 4: Evaluation of the impact of incorporating two additional knowledge (Section 2.3) on subsamples of simulated "species" dataset. The first option is co-alignment information to reference genomes, depicted by (a)-(c). The second option is paired-end reads linkage, depicted by (d)-(f). The ensemble of both is depicted by (g)-(i).

### 3.6 Running Time of COCACOLA, CONCOCT, GroopM, MaxBin and MetaBAT

COCACOLA shares the same data parsing pipeline as CONCOCT and differs only in the binning step, whereas GroopM uses its own workflow. It is reasonable to compare running time of binning directly between COCACOLA and CONCOCT. In order to bring GroopM into context, we take into account the stages related to binning and therefore exclude the data parse stage. As for MaxBin and MetaBAT we simply pre-calculate the abundance and depth information. MaxBin involves multi-threaded parameter, which is set as the number of cores. All of five methods run on the 12-cores and 60GB-RAM computing platform provided by the USC High Performance Computing Cluster. The comparison is conducted on both the simulated datasets and real datasets (Table 1). We conclude that COCACOLA runs faster than CONCOCT, GroopM, MaxBin and MetaBAT.

| Dataset | COCACOLA | | CONCOCT | | GroopM | | MaxBin | | MetaBAT | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Time | Speedup | Time | Speedup | Time | Speedup | Time | Speedup | Time | Speedup |
| "species" | 1m41.50s | 1x | 17m14.71s | 10.2x | 1h57m28s | 69.4x | 49m48.52s | 29.4x | 4m16.14s | 2.5x |
| "strain" | 10.94s | 1x | 1m10.99s | 6.5x | 17m00.46s | 93.3x | 9m54.80s | 54.4x | 2m31.52s | 13.9x |
| "Sharon" | 13.22s | 1x | 25.11s | 1.9x | 4m45.85s | 21.6x | 1m36.09s | 7.3x | 24.66s | 1.9x |
| "MetaHIT" | 2m39.12s | 1x | 20m20.90s | 7.7x | 12m47.68s | 4.8x | 2h20m52s | 53.1x | 7m25.07s | 2.8x |

Table 1: Running Time of COCACOLA, CONCOCT, GroopM, MaxBin and MetaBAT

### 3.7 The Effect of Initialization

To evaluate the effect of initialization on the performance, we conduct the comparison $L_1$ distance and $L_2$ (Euclidean) distance on sub-samples of simulated "species" dataset.

We first evaluate the performance originating from initialization only (Figure 5(a)-(c)). In 6 out of 23 cases, initialization using $L_2$ distance shows better precision whereas suffers worse recall. In the rest cases, initialization using $L_2$ distance is dominated by $L_1$ distance.

We then evaluate the performance of COCACOLA with initialization using $L_1$ and $L_2$ distance. In 8 out of 23 cases, initialization using $L_2$ distance shows better precision whereas suffers worse recall. And in 2 out of 23 cases, initialization using $L_2$ distance shows better recall whereas suffers worse precision. In the rest cases, initialization using $L_2$ distance is dominated by $L_1$ distance. As for ARI, initialization using $L_2$ distance outperforms $L_1$ distance only in 1 out of 23 cases.

We conclude that $L_1$ distance performs better than $L_2$ (Euclidean) distance in initialization.

## 4 Discussion

In this paper, we develop a general framework to bin metagenomic contigs utilizing sequence composition and coverage across multiple samples. Our approach, COCACOLA, outperforms state-of-art binning approaches CONCOCT [2], GroopM [16], MaxBin [41] and MetaBAT [18] on both simulated and real datasets.

The superior performance of COCACOLA relies on several aspects. First, initialization plays an important role in binning accuracy. Second, COCACOLA employs $L_1$ distance instead of Euclidean distance for better taxonomic identification. Third, COCACOLA takes advantage of both hard clustering and soft clustering. Specifically, soft clustering (such as the Gaussian mixture model used by CONCOCT) allows a contig to be assigned probabilistically to multiple OTUs, hence gains more robust results in general in comparison to hard clustering (such as the Hough partitioning used by GroopM). However, in complex environmental samples with strain-level variations, the corresponding OTUs are closely intertwined. Whereas soft clustering in turn further mixes the OTUs up and thus deteriorates clustering performance. COCACOLA obtains better trade-off between hard clustering and soft clustering by exploiting sparsity.

However, we notice that binning metagenomic contigs remains challenging when the number of samples is small, regardless of using COCACOLA, CONCOCT, GroopM, MaxBin or MetaBAT. With small number of metagenomic samples, the relationship between the contigs cannot be accurately inferred based on the relationship between the abundance profiles. Therefore, future research needs to study how to re-weight the contributions of abundance profiles and composition profiles in


Precision by using L1 initialization only
Precision by using L2 initialization only
Recall by using L1 initialization only
Recall by using L2 initialization only
ARI by using L1 initialization only
ARI by using L2 initialization only
Precision by using L1 initialization + COCACOLA
Precision by using L2 initialization + COCACOLA
Recall by using L1 initialization + COCACOLA
Recall by using L2 initialization + COCACOLA
ARI by using L1 initialization + COCACOLA
ARI by using L2 initialization + COCACOLA
10 samples
20 samples
30 samples
40 samples
50 samples
60 samples
70 samples
80 samples
90 samples

(a) (b) (c)

(d) (e) (f)

Fig. 5: Evaluation of the impact of initialization on sub-samples of simulated "species" dataset. The performance comparison only based on initialization with different distance measurements are depicted by (a)-(c). The performance comparison based on initialization with different distance measurements and COCACOLA are depicted by (d)-(f).

unsupervised [7] or semi-supervised [45] scenario. Moreover, recent studies suggest that Euclidean or $L_1$ distance between $l$-mer frequencies do not perform as well as alternative dissimilarity measurements such as $d_2^*$ and $d_2^{(shepp)}$ [38] in comparing genome sequence. However, the use of such measurements is computationally challenging, which needs further exploration.

The COCACOLA framework seamlessly embraces customized knowledge to facilitate binning accuracy. In our study, we have investigated two types of knowledge, in particular, the co-alignment to reference genomes and linkage of contigs provided by paired-end reads. Even though the contributions from additional knowledge diminish when there are sufficient number of samples, they play an important role in binning results when the number of samples is small. In future studies, we intend to explore better customized prior knowledge. one option is exploiting phylogenetic information in taxonomic annotation [29]. Another option relies on identifying functional annotation of contigs, including open reading frames (ORF) that are likely to encode proteins [44], or co-abundance gene groups [28], etc. We have also investigated the ensemble of both co-alignment and linkage knowledge, and it shows more stable performance than individual information. In future studies, we aim to find optimal weights [37] instead of equal weights.

**Acknowledgments** The authors would like to thank anonymous referees for helpful comments on this work. The research is partially supported by NSF DMS-1043075 and OCE 1136818.

## References

1. Albertsen, M., Hugenholtz, P., Skarshewski, A., Nielsen, K.L., Tyson, G.W., Nielsen, P.H.: Genome sequences of rare, uncultured bacteria obtained by differential coverage binning of multiple metagenomes. Nature Biotechnology 31(6), 533–538 (2013)
2. Alneberg, J., Bjarnason, B.S., de Bruijn, I., Schirmer, M., Quick, J., Ijaz, U.Z., Lahti, L., Loman, N.J., Andersson, A.F., Quince, C.: Binning metagenomic contigs by coverage and composition. Nature Methods 11(11), 1144–1146 (2014)
3. Baran, Y., Halperin, E.: Joint analysis of multiple metagenomic samples. PLoS Computational Biology 8(2), e1002373 (2012)
4. Basu, S., Davidson, I., Wagstaff, K.: Constrained clustering: Advances in algorithms, theory, and applications. CRC Press (2008)
5. Brady, A., Salzberg, S.L.: Phymm and PhymmBL: metagenomic phylogenetic classification with interpolated markov models. Nature Methods 6(9), 673–676 (2009)
6. Cai, D., He, X., Han, J., Huang, T.S.: Graph regularized nonnegative matrix factorization for data representation. IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, 33(8), 1548–1560 (2011)
7. Cai, D., Zhang, C., He, X.: Unsupervised feature selection for multi-cluster data. In: Proceedings of the 16th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining. pp. 333–342 (2010)
8. Carr, R., Shen-Orr, S.S., Borenstein, E.: Reconstructing the genomic content of microbiome taxa through shotgun metagenomic deconvolution. PLoS Computational Biology 9(10), e1003292 (2013)
9. Chatterji, S., Yamazaki, I., Bai, Z., Eisen, J.A.: Compostbin: A DNA composition-based algorithm for binning environmental shotgun reads. In: Research in Computational Molecular Biology. pp. 17–28 (2008)
10. Chung, F.R.: Spectral graph theory, vol. 92. American Mathematical Soc. (1997)
11. Consortium, H.M.P., et al.: Structure, function and diversity of the healthy human microbiome. Nature 486(7402), 207–214 (2012)
12. Corduneanu, A., Bishop, C.M.: Variational Bayesian model selection for mixture distributions. In: Artificial intelligence and Statistics. vol. 2001, pp. 27–34 (2001)
13. Davies, D.L., Bouldin, D.W.: A cluster separation measure. IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence 1(2), 224–227 (1979)
14. Huson, D.H., Auch, A.F., Qi, J., Schuster, S.C.: MEGAN analysis of metagenomic data. Genome Research 17(3), 377–386 (2007)
15. Ijaz, U., Quince, C.: TAXAassign v0.4 (Jun 2009), https://github.com/umerijaz/taxaassign/
16. Imelfort, M., Parks, D., Woodcroft, B.J., Dennis, P., Hugenholtz, P., Tyson, G.W.: GroopM: an automated tool for the recovery of population genomes from related metagenomes. PeerJ 2, e603 (2014)
17. Jiang, P., Peng, J., Heath, M., Yang, R.: A clustering approach to constrained binary matrix factorization. In: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery for Big Data, pp. 281–303 (2014)
18. Kang, D.D., Froula, J., Egan, R., Wang, Z.: MetaBAT, an efficient tool for accurately reconstructing single genomes from complex microbial communities. PeerJ 3, e1165 (2015)

19. Kelley, D.R., Salzberg, S.L.: Clustering metagenomic sequences with interpolated Markov models. BMC Bioinformatics 11(1), 544 (2010)
20. Kim, J., Park, H.: Sparse nonnegative matrix factorization for clustering. Technical Report GT-CSE-08-01 (2008)
21. Langville, A.N., Meyer, C.D., Albright, R., Cox, J., Duling, D.: Initializations for the nonnegative matrix factorization. In: Proceedings of the twelfth ACM International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (SIGKDD). pp. 23–26 (2006)
22. Lee, D.D., Seung, H.S.: Learning the parts of objects by non-negative matrix factorization. Nature 401(6755), 788–791 (1999)
23. Liao, R., Zhang, R., Guan, J., Zhou, S.: A new unsupervised binning approach for metagenomic sequences based on n-grams and automatic feature weighting. Computational Biology and Bioinformatics, IEEE/ACM Transactions on 11(1), 42–54 (2014)
24. Liu, Y., Li, Z., Xiong, H., Gao, X., Wu, J., Wu, S.: Understanding and enhancement of internal clustering validation measures. Cybernetics, IEEE Transactions on 43(3), 982–994 (2013)
25. Mande, S.S., Mohammed, M.H., Ghosh, T.S.: Classification of metagenomic sequences: methods and challenges. Briefings in Bioinformatics 13(6), 669–681 (2012)
26. McHardy, A.C., Martín, H.G., Tsirigos, A., Hugenholtz, P., Rigoutsos, I.: Accurate phylogenetic classification of variable-length DNA fragments. Nature Methods 4(1), 63–72 (2007)
27. Mohammed, M.H., Ghosh, T.S., Singh, N.K., Mande, S.S.: SPHINXan algorithm for taxonomic binning of metagenomic sequences. Bioinformatics 27(1), 22–30 (2011)
28. Nielsen, H.B., Almeida, M., Juncker, A.S., Rasmussen, S., Li, J., Sunagawa, S., Plichta, D.R., Gautier, L., Pedersen, A.G., Le Chatelier, E., et al.: Identification and assembly of genomes and genetic elements in complex metagenomic samples without using reference genomes. Nature Biotechnology 32(8), 822–828 (2014)
29. Purdom, E.: Analysis of a data matrix and a graph: Metagenomic data and the phylogenetic tree. The Annals of Applied Statistics pp. 2326–2358 (2011)
30. Qin, J., Li, R., Raes, J., Arumugam, M., Burgdorf, K.S., Manichanh, C., Nielsen, T., Pons, N., Levenez, F., Yamada, T., et al.: A human gut microbial gene catalogue established by metagenomic sequencing. nature 464(7285), 59–65 (2010)
31. Riesenfeld, C.S., Schloss, P.D., Handelsman, J.: Metagenomics: genomic analysis of microbial communities. Annu. Rev. Genet. 38, 525–552 (2004)
32. Rosen, G.L., Reichenberger, E.R., Rosenfeld, A.M.: NBC: the naive bayes classification tool webserver for taxonomic classification of metagenomic reads. Bioinformatics 27(1), 127–129 (2011)
33. Salvador, S., Chan, P.: Determining the number of clusters/segments in hierarchical clustering/segmentation algorithms. In: Proceedings of the 16th IEEEE International Conference on Tools with AI (ICTAI). pp. 576–584 (2004)
34. Sharon, I., Morowitz, M.J., Thomas, B.C., Costello, E.K., Relman, D.A., Banfield, J.F.: Time series community genomics analysis reveals rapid shifts in bacterial species, strains, and phage during infant gut colonization. Genome Research 23(1), 111–120 (2013)
35. Su, C.H., Wang, T.Y., Hsu, M.T., Weng, F.C.H., Kao, C.Y., Wang, D., Tsai, H.K.: The impact of normalization and phylogenetic information on estimating the distance for metagenomes. IEEE/ACM Transactions on Computational Biology and Bioinformatics (TCBB) 9(2), 619–628 (2012)
36. Tang, Y., Sun, F., Sun, Z.: Improved validation index for fuzzy clustering. In: American Control Conference. pp. 1120–1125 (2005)
37. Tsuda, K., Shin, H., Schölkopf, B.: Fast protein classification with multiple networks. Bioinformatics 21(suppl 2), ii59–ii65 (2005)
38. Wan, L., Reinert, G., Sun, F., Waterman, M.S.: Alignment-free sequence comparison (ii): theoretical power of comparison statistics. Journal of Computational Biology 17(11), 1467–1490 (2010)
39. Wiwie, C., Baumbach, J., Röttger, R.: Comparing the performance of biomedical clustering methods. Nature Methods p. (epub ahead of print) (2015)
40. Wood, D.E., Salzberg, S.L.: Kraken: ultrafast metagenomic sequence classification using exact alignments. Genome Biol 15(3), R46 (2014)
41. Wu, Y.W., Simmons, B.A., Singer, S.W.: MaxBin 2.0: an automated binning algorithm to recover genomes from multiple metagenomic datasets. Bioinformatics p. btv638 (2015)
42. Wu, Y.W., Ye, Y.: A novel abundance-based algorithm for binning metagenomic sequences using l-tuples. Journal of Computational Biology 18(3), 523–534 (2011)
43. Yang, B., Peng, Y., Leung, H.C., Yiu, S.M., Chen, J.C., Chin, F.Y.: Unsupervised binning of environmental genomic fragments based on an error robust selection of l-mers. BMC bioinformatics 11(Suppl 2), S5 (2010)
44. Ye, Y., Tang, H.: An ORFome assembly approach to metagenomics sequences analysis. Journal of Bioinformatics and Computational Biology 7(03), 455–471 (2009)
45. Zhao, Z., Liu, H.: Semi-supervised Feature Selection via Spectral Analysis. In: SDM. pp. 641–646 (2007)